

To: "Steve Chen" <steve@youtube.com>  
From: "Maryrose Dunton" <maryrose@youtube.com>  
Cc: "heather gillette" <heather@youtube.com>, "Micah Schaffer" <micah@youtube.com>, "Hurley Chad" <chad@youtube.com>  
Bcc:  
Received Date: 2006-01-31 19:39:37 CST  
Subject: Re: takedown script

---

Alright, so currently you can not reject a video specifically as copyrighted. Do we want to add two new actions to the admin tool:

Reject - Copyright  
Strike - Copyright

We could send something simple to the copyright owner with a link to our DMCA policy and counter notification instructions. We would send a slightly 'escalated' notification for a 2nd strike.

"Your video [insert video name] has been rejected for copyright infringement. If you feel you are the legal content owner of this video and have been falsely accused of copyright infringement, you may file a DMCA counter notification."

On Jan 31, 2006, at 3:02 AM, Steve Chen wrote:

> Ah ha. I see what you're saying.  
>  
> Maryrose, can we get someone to implement a thing to send out a  
> standard copyrights infringement thing to the users when their  
> video is rejected for copyright reasons? I think we should also  
> rope in the folks at Wilson Sonsini for clearance on the notice we  
> send to these users?  
>  
> -s  
>  
> On Jan 30, 2006, at 3:01 PM, heather gillette wrote:  
>  
>> Yeah this system is better, but we are not messaging at all to the  
>> users  
>> what they are doing wrong. I've found that the responses I get to  
>> the  
>> takedown email when I send it are that of clueless-ness and when I  
>> don't  
>> send it, I get many emails to support where they just don't  
>> understand why  
>> their videos was rejected. Isn't it better to keep the user and  
>> have them  
>> become a good user, than to delete and remove a user the  
>> unknowingly was  
>> doing something wrong?  
>>  
>> Also, this takedown notice is what we are supposed to do under the  
>> DMCA, in  
>> addition to it being a valuable message that deters future uploads.

>>  
>> Heather  
>>  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: Steve Chen [mailto:steve@youtube.com]  
>> Sent: Monday, January 30, 2006 2:55 PM  
>> To: heather gillette  
>> Cc: 'Micah Schaffer'  
>> Subject: Re: takedown script  
>>  
>> Yup, let's set this meeting up. To the latter point, aren't we  
>> forcing people to confirm email addresses and we can use the 3-  
>> strikes system to prevent them from using the system again?  
>>  
>> -s  
>>  
>> On Jan 30, 2006, at 2:41 PM, heather gillette wrote:  
>>  
>>> Steve,  
>>>  
>>> Attached is the email I send to the users whose WWE or ROH videos  
>>> have been  
>>> deleted so you can see.  
>>>  
>>> I think your point about 'Matt Dancing' brings up another point  
>>> that video  
>>> rejections should be reversible or at least there should be some  
>>> control or  
>>> intelligence built in so that if a really popular video is about  
>>> to be  
>>> rejected there is a popup that says, 'this video has been viewed  
>>> 20,000  
>>> times, are you sure you want to reject?' this way we have some  
>>> safeguards in  
>>> place and we can feel free to build other tools to help ease the  
>>> manual  
>>> process that we have now in rejecting videos for copyright.  
>>>  
>>> Bottom line, the system that we have now is painful and we are not  
>>> preventing users from uploading more copyrighted videos because we  
>>> are not  
>>> messaging what they have done wrong, or if we are, I am manually  
>>> sending the  
>>> warning emails explaining what they have done wrong. Could we get  
>>> together  
>>> and brainstorm what everyone's needs and fears are? This way we  
>>> can all  
>>> come to a final compromise and hopefully get some improved tools/  
>>> automation  
>>> in the pipeline?  
>>>  
>>> I think the following people need to meet to discuss this:  
>>>  
>>> Maryrose  
>>> Micah  
>>> Heather  
>>> Brent  
>>> Steve

>>>  
>>> Thanks!  
>>>  
>>> Heather  
>>>  
>>> -----Original Message-----  
>>> From: Steve Chen [mailto:steve@youtube.com]  
>>> Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2006 4:40 PM  
>>> To: heather gillette  
>>> Cc: 'Micah Schaffer'  
>>> Subject: Re: takedown script  
>>>  
>>> Is it a generic Cease & Desist letter that we sent to all infringing  
>>> parties? Or is it tailored to the specific case/companies in  
>>> question?  
>>>  
>>> We can build this, it's not very difficult to do.  
>>>  
>>> After finding out one of our most popular videos (matt dancing) was  
>>> accidentally removed from the system, I'm getting increasingly more  
>>> worried about limiting access for people to reject videos. With the  
>>> interns coming in, we're essentially granting these interns on their  
>>> first days a way to remove every video on the system. Furthermore,  
>>> we have no system of record that tracks who did what in the system.  
>>> Lastly, we have no way of correcting this problem.  
>>>  
>>> That's why I'm very reluctant to make rejecting videos 1) easier or  
>>> 2) more automated for mass rejections.  
>>>  
>>> I don't know what the final solution will look like but whatever it  
>>> is, I know it must include a more robust "checks & balances" system  
>>> implemented as some kind of tiered approval process where to mass  
>>> reject videos, it's not as easy as any one of the 15 folks with  
>>> admin  
>>> access to go in and type a search word and hitting a button.  
>>>  
>>> -s  
>>>  
>>> On Jan 27, 2006, at 11:42 AM, heather gillette wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Just to clarify, 'Cease and Desist' is what the WWE and ROH refers  
>>>> to when  
>>>> they talk about the warning email we send. I am used to referring  
>>>> to it as  
>>>> such because this is the terminology they use.  
>>>>  
>>>> -----Original Message-----  
>>>> From: heather gillette [mailto:heather@youtube.com]  
>>>> Sent: Friday, January 27, 2006 11:39 AM  
>>>> To: 'Micah Schaffer'; 'Steve Chen'  
>>>> Subject: RE: takedown script  
>>>>  
>>>> To further reiterate what Micah says below, the companies that are  
>>>> requesting that we remove these copyrighted videos are also  
>>>> requesting that  
>>>> we send Cease and Desist letter to the users who have uploaded  
>>>> these videos.  
>>>> Because we do not give the companies the user info they are unable

>>> to send  
>>> these Cease and Desist notifications to the infringer themselves.  
>>> That  
>>> being said, it is a manual process sending this notification to  
>>> each of the  
>>> infringers and it would be much more efficient if this notification  
>>> was  
>>> built into the admin tool and the email notification, via a  
>>> differentiation  
>>> that the video was removed for copyright infringement rather than  
>>> porn.  
>>>  
>>> Heather  
>>>  
>>> -----Original Message-----  
>>> From: Micah Schaffer [mailto:micah@youtube.com]  
>>> Sent: Friday, January 27, 2006 11:27 AM  
>>> To: Steve Chen  
>>> Cc: heather gillette  
>>> Subject: Re: takedown script  
>>>  
>>> When we're flagging 100+ DMCA'd URLs, it's difficult to flag them  
>>> all in  
>>> the admin interface when they are mixed in with user-flagged-porn  
>>> that  
>>> needs to be reviewed (the problem is compounded by having multiple  
>>> people using the admin tool). But most importantly, we need to be  
>>> able  
>>> to send a different automated warning email to copyright violators  
>>> than  
>>> everyone else.. they need information on what they are doing wrong  
>>> and  
>>> they need to be told about the counter notice process.  
>>>  
>>> Micah  
>>>  
>>> Steve Chen wrote:  
>>>> Micah --  
>>>>  
>>>> I'm not sure why this is necessary? Let me know if I'm  
>>>> misunderstanding  
>>>> the situation, but it seems to me, the reasons in the drop-down  
>>>> that  
>>>> show up on the flag video page serves only as customer-facing eye  
>>>> candy. When we see it from our admin portal, the result is that  
>>>> it'll  
>>>> be approved or rejected (variations thereof). Furthermore, if  
>>>> I see  
>>>> it's flagged from an admin user, I will pay attention to it even  
>>>> more...  
>>>>  
>>>> -s  
>>>>  
>>>> On Jan 23, 2006, at 12:42 PM, Micah Schaffer wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> While we're at it, we should consider adding a value for  
>>>>> 'copyright'  
>>>>> to the 'reason' variable in flag\_video. Not to be accessible to

```
>>>> users,  
>>>> just admins.  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> <takedown.txt>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>
```

---